

California Local HSIP Advisory Committee

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 17, 2018

1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

Sacramento International Airport
Terminal A, 2nd Floor, Air-Media Conference Room
(916) 874-0182

Attendees: Tom Mattson, Ken Kochevar, Chiu Liu, Ross McKeown, Philip Chu, Robert Peterson, Richard Ke, Carlos Rios, Stephanie Holloway, Susan Herman, Tracy Coan
By phone: Bob Goralka, Heidi Borders

Time*	Topic	Lead(s)
1:15 pm	<p>Note: Decisions and Action items in boldface</p> <p>Welcome and Confirmation of Membership/Other Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Norman Baculinao (Ventura) has agreed to represent CSAC as a voting member on the committee• Stephanie will follow up with Trisha Tillotson (Nevada) to be CSAC alternate• Carlos will assume voting membership status on committee and confirm with CLC leadership that this is acceptable; he will assign an alternate—Sunil Rajpal (to be confirmed) <p>Shawn Oliver (FHWA) and Tammy Massengale (Caltrans NEPA delegation—local roads) will attend the March 15 meeting. As the districts statewide vary on many factors, defining categorical exclusions has been a challenge and most NEPA decisions are currently made on a case-by-case basis. Shawn and Tammy will want to gather examples of how NEPA processes have slowed down project completion. Bob and Stephanie will invite technical staff from their counties to provide substantive evidence.</p> <p>As of November 2017, ~\$14M of HSIP projects have been delivered. Overall about 10% of the OA Obligations (including Local HSIP, Local Highway Bridge, and others) have been delivered at the end of October 2017 as compared to 1.1% the prior year so off to a good start.</p> <p>SSARP Update: Only 26 agencies have not yet requested their allocations. DLA will send reminders about the May 30 deadline.</p> <p>Robert will present to tribal governments in Redding on February 7 about the HSIP program and eligible countermeasures, and will note also that the Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) is the preferred method to program funds.</p>	Robert

	<p>Today's SacBee highlights the Route 49 roundabout in Plymouth: http://www.sacbee.com/news/local/transportation/article194192719.html</p> <p>This was a local agency delivered project that had multiple funding sources tied to it. (Local HSIP, Local funding, state funding). Extra funding from the Local HSIP at the 11th hour helped get this project constructed.</p>	
1:40 pm	<p>NACE Update/Local Roadway Safety Plan Pilot</p> <p>At the NACE conference on April 22 FHWA will host a hands-on session to highlight local road safety plans (LRSPs). Participants include state transportation officials from LA, WI, CO, NV, FL, OH, CA as well as county engineers from Humboldt, Trinity, Marin, Yolo, and Santa Barbara Counties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephanie will follow up with Trish Tillotson regarding Nevada County's participation • Backups may include Ventura (Jeff Pratt) and/or Sacramento County (Mike Penrose); Ken to follow up <p>Idea behind the LRSPs is that they are more concise and can be more quickly implemented than State Highway Safety Plans (SHSPs), which take about one year to develop, 3-4 years to implement. At the conference a template will be provided, which can be fleshed out and put into action within 2-3 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web conferences on Jan 24, and in Feb & March (dates available from Ken) will overview the data, tools, countermeasures, stakeholders, and partnerships involved • Plans take approximately 80 hours to create (according to State of Washington officials) and focus on each local agency's top priorities based on their data such as traffic volumes, primary accident causes • Santa Barbara is already piloting a LRSP(Note: as of 2/25, this appears to be on hold due to the flooding and mudslide disasters the county is dealing with) • Hillary Isebrands' FHWA team will provide support as needed for data collection • Ken will ask for a sample LRSP from Hillary to distribute <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could funds not requested for SSARP allocation be made available to an MPO for a region-wide strategic project similar to the LRSP? • Difference between SSARP and LRSP? SSARP delves into cost/benefit analysis with the goal of identifying specific engineering projects. LRSP is for overall strategy, similar to SHSP but tailored to local scale and data; can incorporate educational and enforcement solutions in addition to engineering • Having an LRSP provides documentation for advocate groups about funding for sidewalks and the like <p>Robert has applied for funding to hold a 2-day peer exchange this summer (proposed location: CSUS Napa or Modoc Hall) to engage with up to 50-60 agencies on how to use Data Driven Safety Analysis(DDSA) to develop Local Road Safety Plans. The will help in knowing where to apply for HSIP or</p>	Ken

	leverage other funding sources and incorporate safety countermeasures into other local agency projects.	
1:50 pm	<p>Concerns with the FHWA RRFB Memo</p> <p>On December 21, 2017, FHWA terminated its approval for Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) due to a patent issue. Projects that are in Construction phase can swap out different equipment for RRFB if needed without a formal approval process. Local agencies can email their DLAE to create a record of the need to change equipment. Costs incurred due to change orders with contractors are covered. This affects 28 Local HSIP projects currently in the Design phase.</p> <p>More info here: https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/interim_approval/ia11/faq/index.htm http://library.ite.org/pub/cf55d3db-fe2c-d7cf-270e-141af5c56a4d</p>	Robert
2:10 pm	<p>Delivery Status for All Safety Projects (handout)</p> <p>62 HSIP projects are currently in construction delay. After May 2018 deadline, Chiu will provide rationales for extension or de-programming for committee to make final determination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DLA will message agencies directly this month, with cc to DLAE: reminder that if agencies are on the delay list without documentation of the reason for delay, they are ineligible to apply for next cycle of HSIP funds • DLA to communicate with Huntington Beach about bundling individual projects into one <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental clearance should be minimal for traffic signal work. Why are so many signal projects delayed? • If an agency wishes to “de-bundle” multiple HSIP projects that were approved as part of a systemic plan, would this change require re-applying with all new B/C calculations? No, it is possible to get a partial construction authorization for the part of the project that is ready. The project proceeds in phases with different Federal IDs. 	Chiu
2:20 pm	<p>Cycle 9 Schedules, Allocation Updates, and Discussions</p> <p>DLA will send a heads-up announcement in February about the upcoming Cycle 9 call for projects and will include info about the MUTCD mandate for horizontal signing on roads with ADT 1000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a webinar will be delivered in March featuring the mandate info as well as the HSIP Analyzer tool • The new cycle will be officially announced by April 2018 • Applications will be due August 31, to allow agencies time for both HSIP and ATP (due July 31- this could change) 	Tom/Richard

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A note will be included on the February flyer about new, easier application and ability to get application submitted in earlier than deadline • Flyer will also include info about “target” competitive & set aside amounts that could be adjusted depending on delivery of current cycle <p>Cycle 9 includes a \$10M per agency cap; HFST is subject to B/C but other set-asides (guardrail, pedestrian, horizontal signage) will not count toward per agency cap. Minimum project cost is \$100K. Set-asides for Cycle 9 were determined at the November meeting. Because of pending de-obligations, the total amount available to program is unclear; should have better idea by the time project review begins and certainly by January 2019.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the cap is under \$160M, proportionally reduce all set-asides as well (except for \$2M for tribes) so they make up no more than 25% of total programming capacity? Yes. • \$40M is a lot of set-asides already, so if cap goes up to \$180M just keep them the same • No new call for SSARs—future call for SSARP would be separate from HSIP • Updated Benefit-Cost Analysis Model incorporates higher collision costs, which will automatically lower B/C ratios • The MPO FTIP administrators would like to have latest group listing by March 2018, showing movement of project programming from FY 17-18 to the next 4-year FTIP cycle. MPO must release public notice in June. This December, a new FTIP will be approved and will include Cycle 9 projects that have been amended in. <p>Minimum B/C for Cycle 9 will stay at 3.5 (Reason: Collision costs will be updated which increases B/C’s when compared to Cycle 8 projects of similar scope, number of crashes and CMF’s. Also the reduced funding capacity for this this call will reduce the number of potential applications that local agencies will complete as lower B/C projects may not get programmed.)</p>	
3:15 pm	<p>HSIP Analyzer</p> <p>An updated link will be sent in coming days; committee members are invited to try out the Analyzer by entering sample numbers. The interactive form allows some fields to be auto-populated depending on entries in earlier sections. The fields for B/C disappear if Set-Aside is selected as the Application Category. User Manual is also being developed.</p>	Richard
3:30 pm	<p>Round Table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While it might be helpful to pursue fund exchanges with SB-1, this should wait until after November for political reasons • Does the \$100K minimum project cost for HSIP need further analysis or increase (say \$300K)? Many projects on con-delay list are in the 	All

	<p>\$200-300K range, which may indicate that some agencies have determined these are not worth the administrative time required for federalizing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How might the pedestrian crossing enhancement set-aside be better marketed for Cycle 9? In last cycle much of this money was shifted to guardrail and the B/C projects. • What data source(s) are most agencies using—are most maintaining their own Crossroads database and reporting their own property damage only (PDO) numbers to CHP? Latest on data entry backlogs for TIMS/SWITRS? 	
4:00 pm	Adjourn	
Next Meeting: Thursday, March 15, 2018, 1-4 PM, Air-Media Conference Room		
<p><u>Future Agenda Topics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on LRSP peer exchange for summer 2018 • New procedure/timeline for sending group listing to MPOs to allow them to meet Dec FTIP deadline • Updates after SSARs are complete: Could funds not requested for SSARP allocation be made available to an MPO for a region-wide strategic project similar to the LRSP? What are differences in projects funded at \$250K vs. lower amounts in similar regions? Did some agencies simply request the max amount? 		